

REMARKS

The Office Action of June 20, 2006 has been carefully considered.

Objection has been raised to the drawings as not showing the elements of claim 3. Claim 3 has now been canceled.

Objection has been raised to claims 12, 13, 14 and 18. Corrections have been made to claims 12, 14 and 18 in the manner requested in the Office Action; claim 13 has been canceled.

Claims 5-9, 16 and 18-19 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph.

In claim 18, the processing module in line 36 has been amended to refer back to line 6.

Claims 5, 6, 7, 8 and 16 now depend directly or from claim 4, providing antecedent basis for all terminology. In claim 19, "said packet processing module" refers back to line 25 of claim 18.

Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) over Tienan et al. While Applicants continue to traverse this rejection, claims 1-3 have now been canceled, and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 4, 10-13 and 18-19 have been found to be allowable over the art; claims 4 and 10-13 have been allowed. Applicants submit that the remaining prior art rejections have been rendered moot by the amendments to claims 5-7 to depend from allowed claim 4, and the amendment to claim 14 to depend from claim 12, which depends ultimately from claim 4.

Withdrawal of the remaining prior art rejections is requested.

Claim 1 only has been rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claim 1 of co-pending

application serial no. 09/753,399. As claim 1 has been canceled, this rejection is believed to have been rendered moot.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. An early allowance of the application with amended claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Ira J. Schultz

Registration No. 28666

LAW OFFICES
DENNISON, SCHULTZ & MACDONALD
SUITE 105
1727 KING STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22314-2700
703 837-9600